



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,833	07/28/2003	Assaf Silberstein	ASSIA 20.548	5834
26304 7590 02/06/2008 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			EXAMINER LONG, FONYA M	
			ART UNIT 4127	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/628,833	Applicant(s) SILBERSTEIN, ASSAF	
	Examiner FONYA LONG	Art Unit 4127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/28/2003; 10/18/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1-16, as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per Claims 1 and 15, the claims recites the limitation "the logic" in Line 3 for Claim 1 and Line 2 for Claim 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As per Claim 10, the claim recites the limitation "the ticket" in Line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As per Claim 14, the claim recites the limitation "said enterprise" in Line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As per Claim 15, the claim recites the limitations "the secretary" in Line 3 and "the reception center" in Line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

As per Claim 15, it is unclear whether the limitation stating "the method provides for queue management of users that is hardware independent, the method comprising: scheduling, arriving, waiting, and servicing" is meant to be included as part of Claim 15,

because of spacing and grammatical errors. For the purposes of examination, Examiner considers the limitation to be included as part of Claim 15.

As per Claim 16, the claim recites the limitation “the queue” in Line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and in further view of Goss et al. (6,654,815).

As per Claim 1, Bondarenko et al. discloses at least one Web-based server for an organization containing the logic and central systems functions ([0031] discloses a web server); and a Web client application allowing interaction between the users and said web-based server, and accessible through a browser on client workstations (Abstract, discloses an interactive link that is presented to a user accessing the web page that connects the user to the facility for monitoring communication status). However, Bondarenko et al. fails to explicitly disclose a database installed on a Structured Query Language server; an announcer server, and; an automated receptionist.

Watson et al. discloses a queue management system with the concept of an announcer server for activating at least one of the following: displays; and speakers, according to orders from said at least one Web-based server ([0020] discloses once the customer has received their customer number, the customer waits until the customer display [0012] which is linked to the service point management system via a data network, displays to the customer an indication that a customer assistant is free to serve that customer); and an automated receptionist for issuing tickets to, and otherwise interacting with, users ([0009] discloses issuing each customer a queue number onto a ticket which the customer retains).

Therefore, from the teaching of Watson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for displaying an estimated wait time of Bondarenko et al. to include an announcer server and an automation receptionist as taught by Watson et al. in order to provide an organized approach to servicing customers that waiting for a service and providing notification as to when the customer will be helped.

Goss et al. discloses a Contact Server that enables customer to submit call-back requests to a call center with the concept of a database installed on a Structured Query Language (SQL) server for record maintenance and interactions with said web-based server and said client application (Col. 5, Lines 35-45, discloses a Microsoft's SQL server being used for the state tables that are stored on a database).

Therefore, from the teaching of Goss et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et

al. and Watson et al. combination to include a database installed on a Structured Query Language server as taught by Goss et al. in order to aid in managing data stored in the system.

As per Claim 3, Bondarenko et al. discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, Bondarenko et al. fails to explicitly disclose an automated ticket printer.

Watson et al. discloses a queue management system with the concept of the receptionist issuing tickets via an automated ticket printer ([0009] discloses issuing each customer a queue number through a device which allocates a sequential queue number to successive customers and prints out these details onto a ticket with the customer retains).

Therefore, from the teaching of Watson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for displaying an estimated wait time of Bondarenko et al. to include an automated ticket printer as taught by Watson et al. in order to aid in providing an organized method in assisting customers in the order in which they arrive.

As per Claim 4, Bondarenko et al. discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, Bondarenko et al. fails to explicitly disclose standard hardware.

Watson et al. discloses a queue management system with the concept of standard hardware being attached to the system ([0015] discloses the customer number

allocation device having a printer with upon activation by a customer allows the printing of a ticket).

Therefore, from the teaching of Watson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for displaying an estimated wait time of Bondarenko et al. to include a standard hardware as taught by Watson et al. to provide printing means in order for a customer to receive a ticket.

As per Claim 8, Bondarenko et al. discloses a browser being used for other business applications ([0041] discloses the web browser being used to provide interactive advertisements for products and services provided by an enterprise).

As per Claim 11, Bondarenko et al. discloses the system inserting personal information onto a display screen ([0004] discloses the system transferring relevant information about the client to a computer screen used by the agent).

4. Claims 2, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and Goss et al. (6,654,815), as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Ananian (US 2003/0028451).

As per Claim 2, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose .NET technology.

Ananian discloses an interactive digital catalog with the concept of a system being based on .NET technology ([0123] discloses Microsoft's .NET as the web based development platform).

Therefore, from the teaching of Ananian, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include .NET technology as taught by Ananian in order to provide web services to the user.

As per Claim 12, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the system printing out forms to be filled out.

Ananian discloses an interactive digital catalog with the concept of a system printing forms to be filled out ([0345] discloses a fax order form being printed to be filled out by the user in order to place an order).

Therefore, from the teaching of Ananian, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include printing out forms to be filled out as taught by Ananian in order to expedite the time required to assist a user.

As per Claim 13, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose a system printing marketing brochures.

Ananian discloses an interactive digital catalog with the concept of a system printing marketing brochures ([0004] discloses catalogs being printed as a paper medium. Catalogs include direct mail offering, bulletins, flyers, and posters).

Therefore, from the teaching of Ananian, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include printing marketing brochures as taught by Ananian in order to inform users of the products and services available.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and Goss et al. (6,654,815), as applied to Claim 4 above, and in further view of Patel et al. (5,566,278).

The Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the system communicating with the standard hardware using standard drivers.

Patel et al. discloses a printing system with the concept of communicating with the standard hardware using standard drivers, for at least one of the following: printers; and speakers (Abstract, discloses a printer communicating with the operating system by means of a standard interface such as printer drivers).

Therefore, from the teaching of Patel et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include the system communicating

with the standard hardware using standard drivers as taught by Patel et al. in order to provide a ticket to the user.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and Goss et al. (6,654,815), as applied to Claim 4 above, and in further view of Paradise (EP 0410668).

The Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the system communicating with the standard hardware using specially customized drivers.

Paradise discloses a queue management process with the concept of the system communicating with the standard hardware using specially customized drivers (Col. 6, Lines 9-16, discloses the system using custom drivers).

Therefore, from the teaching of Paradise, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include the system communicating with the standard hardware using specially customized drivers as taught by Paradise in order to provide a ticket to the user.

7. Claims 7, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and Goss et al. (6,654,815), as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Petrovykh (US 2003/0231647).

As per Claim 7, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the Web client application being accessible through the browser on a handheld device.

Petrovykh discloses a system for optimizing response time to events in queue with the concept of the Web client application being accessible through a browser on a handheld device ([0090] discloses a client on-/off-line status information may be obtained concerning multiple independent terminal devices, such as a cellular phone).

Therefore, from the teaching of Petrovykh, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include the Web client application being accessible through the browser on a handheld device as taught by Petrovykh in order to provide the user with mobility in accessing the queue time.

As per Claim 9, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the standard hardware comprising at least one wireless device.

Petrovykh discloses a system for optimizing response time to events in queue with the concept of the standard hardware comprising at least one wireless device ([0063] discloses a user may utilize some other Internet-capable appliance other than a PC where the connection line may be a wireless link).

Therefore, from the teaching of Petrovykh, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et

al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include the standard hardware comprising at least one wireless device as taught by Petrovykh in order to provide remote connectivity for the standard hardware to the system.

As per Claim 14, the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the system administration functions comprising a user ID and passwords.

Petrovykh discloses a system for optimizing response time to events in queue with the concept of the system administration functions comprising at least one of the following: hardware configuration; business logic; and user ID and passwords can be performed from anywhere in said enterprise ([0162] discloses every client subscribing to the system being given a member ID number and passwords).

Therefore, from the teaching of Petrovykh, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include the system administration functions comprising a user ID and passwords as taught by Petrovykh in order to provide a security when accessing the system.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and Goss et al. (6,654,815), as applied to Claim 1 above, and in further view of Jones et al. (5,689,698).

The Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose inserting personal information into the ticket.

Jones et al. discloses a method for providing access to data stored in a server with the concept of inserting personal information into the ticket (Col. 11, Lines 60-67, discloses a service ticket containing the name of the client).

Therefore, from the teaching of Jones et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include inserting personal information into the ticket in order to identify the user.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923) and in further view of Goss et al. (6,654,815) and Thygeson et al. (6,961,418).

Bondarenko et al. discloses at least one Web-based server for an organization containing the logic and central systems functions ([0031] discloses a web server); and a Web client application allowing interaction between the users and said web-based server, and accessible through a browser on client workstations (Abstract, discloses an interactive link that is presented to a user accessing the web page that connects the user to the facility for monitoring communication status). However, Bondarenko et al. fails to explicitly disclose a database installed on a Structured Query Language server; an announcer server; an automated receptionist; and a method comprising: scheduling, arriving, waiting, and servicing.

Watson et al. discloses a queue management system with the concept of an announcer server for activating at least one of the following: displays; and speakers, according to orders from said at least one Web-based server ([0020] discloses once the customer has received their customer number, the customer waits until the customer display [0012] which is linked to the service point management system via a data network, displays to the customer an indication that a customer assistant is free to serve that customer); and an automated receptionist for issuing tickets to, and otherwise interacting with, users ([0009] discloses issuing each customer a queue number onto a ticket which the customer retains).

Therefore, from the teaching of Watson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for displaying an estimated wait time of Bondarenko et al. to include an announcer server and an automation receptionist as taught by Watson et al. in order to provide an organized approach to servicing customers that waiting for a service and providing notification as to when the customer will be helped.

Goss et al. discloses a Contact Server that enables customer to submit call-back requests to a call center with the concept of a database installed on a Structured Query Language (SQL) server for record maintenance and interactions with said web-based server and said client application (Col. 5, Lines 35-45, discloses a Microsoft's SQL server being used for the state tables that are stored on a database).

Therefore, from the teaching of Goss et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et

al. and Watson et al. combination to include a database installed on a Structured Query Language server as taught by Goss et al. in order to aid in managing data stored in the system.

Thygeson et al. discloses an appointment system with the concept of a method for a queue management of user comprising: scheduling, wherein the user contacts the secretary or a call center; arriving, wherein the user arrives at the reception center and approaches the kiosk; waiting wherein the user waits until called; and servicing, wherein the user and agent interact (Col. 10, Lines 57-67, discloses a patient scheduling a phone appointment. Time passes until the time for the phone appointment arrives. The patient waits for the call from the invention. The patent then receives a service by talking with the physician.)

Therefore, from the teaching of Thygeson et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., and Goss et al. combination to include a method for a queue management of user comprising: scheduling; arriving; waiting; and servicing as taught by Thygeson et al. in order to aid in decreasing the wait time for a user to receive a service.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bondarenko et al. (US 2002/0105957) in view of Watson et al. (US 2006/0287923), Goss et al. (6,654,815), and Thygeson et al. (6,961,418), as applied to Claim 15 above, and in further view of Perkins et al. (US 2002/0038309).

The Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., Goss et al., and Thygeson et al. combination discloses the claimed invention. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose abandoning.

Perkins et al. discloses a method for integrating one or more external systems with the concept of waiting further comprises abandoning wherein the user leaves the queue ([0024] discloses a customer abandoning a call before it reaches an agent).

Therefore, from the teaching of Perkins et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Bondarenko et al., Watson et al., Goss et al., and Thygeson et al. combination to including abandoning as taught by Perkins et al. in order to aid in identifying the next user when a user has left the queue.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sim (6,529,786) discloses a queue management system.

Sahlin (US 2003/0177141) discloses a method for customer queue management.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FONYA LONG whose telephone number is (571)270-5096. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon/Fri [7:30am/5:00pm EST] with First Fri. Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on (571) 270-3033. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FML

/Lynda Jasmin/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4127

Application/Control Number: 10/628,833
Art Unit: 4127

Page 17